

University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1931

Literary patronage in the Elizabethan Age.

Mary Catherine Coll
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>



Part of the [Modern Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Coll, Mary Catherine, "Literary patronage in the Elizabethan Age." (1931). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1694.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1694>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

LITERARY PATRONAGE IN THE ELIZABETHAN AGE

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty

Of the Graduate School of the University of Louisville

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Of Master of Arts

Department of English

By

Mary Catherine Coll

**Year
1931**

28 Apr. '39 RH.

LITERARY PATRONAGE IN THE ELIZABETHAN AGE

CONTENTS

Chapters

- I. Introduction.
- II. Patronage in the Elizabethan Age.
- III. Two Outstanding Elizabethans and Their Patrons.
- IV. Conclusion

Bibliography

CHAPTER I

Introduction

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The patron is really the outgrowth of an elaborate civilization; the sympathizer must have preceded him. Individual appreciation of art side by side with the more impersonal public appreciation of it resulted in literary patronage, an aristocratic fostering spirit arising from this recognition of worth. The system of literary patronage has usually coincided with the existence of a despotic or at least highly aristocratic and oligarchical form of society.

The Teutonic custom of honouring genius in the person of the scop was continued in England by Alfred and Henry Beauclerc, though the group of cultured aristocrats is much smaller than that of Renaissance Italy. Following the lead of that seat of culture, the practice was confined during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to the monarchs, royal family, and some of the ecclesiastical dignitaries. Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, son of Henry IV, is the first English example of the Italian princely patron

and lover of learning. His proteges were Peacock, Copgrove, and Lydgate. At a time, moreover, when patrons were a necessity to every literary man, the "good Duke" acted the part of a Maecenas. He was proud of his patronage of scholars and styled himself and was addressed as "litteratissimus".

However, in the sixteenth century there was a "fairly general recognition, on the part of the nobility, of their obligations as patrons of literature".¹ At the same time this feeling was more of a desire for personal fame than any real love for letters. As Dr. Holzknecht says, "It is a matter of much doubt if a real and fundamental love of literature was at the bottom of early Renaissance patronage; rather it is apparent that the thirst for posthumous glory was the motive."² To perpetuate a name was a fervent passion of the time. The writer realized the fact, which as been to the advantage of authors since earliest times, that all princes are proud and hope for the immortality of

-
1. Sheavyn, Phoebe, The Literary Profession in The Elizabethan Age, Manchester, 1909, p. 10.
 2. Holzknecht, Karl, Literary Patronage, Philadelphia, 1923, p. 72.

their glory;¹ hence it comes about that the most glorious prince in deeds is also the most prized patron of literature. The poet and the historian are undoubtedly excellent heralds of fame.

The most agreeable form of support for the scholar of the early Renaissance was a regular pension from some rich patron. The author had no reason for feeling humbled, because in return for financial help the patron received honor. "This was the very essence of such patronage. . . . It was a relation of honour not to be reduced to commercial terms."² Money was given not for the scholar's services, but for the necessary leisure to pursue his aims. There was no need here for servile flattery on the part of the writer; but, as in all other relations of honor, this system was open to abuses. In Chaucer's time patronage was a satisfactory relation when income and permanent connection were provided in return for "literary

-
1. Though Spenser in his Faerie Queene expected the glory of Elizabeth to bring immortal fame upon its author, the usual feeling was that the patron is immortalized by the work dedicated to him. See Amoretti lxi, lxxv.
 2. Emerton, Ephraim, Erasmus, New York and London, 1899, p. 31.

work of interest and value". The troubles of the patron were shared by the writer.

Erasmus accepted this most untrammelled form of financial dependence, though he insisted on perfect freedom, as is shown in his letter to Battus: "If the Lady or if Mountjoy will furnish the means I shall get my Doctor's degree in Italy. If not, I must go without the degree. . . . I am as poor as a rat, but, as you know, I must and I will be free."¹

Certainly the attitude of the patron had a great effect upon the literature produced. Holzknecht says, "Patrons of arts have for the most part been men of high tastes, who demand a high degree of finish; hence, courtly ages of private patronage produce works of highest craftsmanship and have given the world much of its finest literature. The advantages of patronage are immense, but it is indispensable that the patron himself be great."²

It is the purpose of this paper to show from

-
1. Froude, J. A. Life and Letters of Erasmus, New York, 1894, p. 57.
 2. Holzknecht, K. Literary Patronage, p. 11.

a literary standpoint mainly ^{the relations} existing between writer and patron during the reign of Elizabeth and years immediately following. As a great number of the poets of Elizabeth's reign wrote also in that of James', any other division seems arbitrary. Thus the period chosen dates from about 1550 to 1640, when most of those writers who had added to the brilliance of Elizabeth's court had died. We shall study the conditions under which authors lived before their greatest patron, the public, was a distinct factor. The influence of patrons on the two most outstanding figures in the literature of the period, Shakespeare and Spenser, will be taken up in detail.

-
1. The economic side is treated by Miss Sheavyn in the first five chapters of The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age, pp. 1-123.

CHAPTER II

Patronage in the Elizabethan Age

CHAPTER II

PATRONAGE IN THE ELIZABETHAN AGE

The reign of Elizabeth marks the gradual disintegration of the aristocratic system of private literary patronage, for with the development of printing and the growth of the reading public, came economic independence on the part of the writer. The new trends in education emphasizing the Humanities, the fashion of literature at court, the growing accessibility of books, and general popularity of poetry and drama opened up new fields to writers. Thus, the class of professional writers increased out of proportion to the number of patrons. At the same time patronage was the only means of subsistence until books were generally recognized in the world of trade. The only persons to whom these struggling scholars could turn were the higher nobility and the older country gentry, and neither class was very wealthy or very numerous. The increasing lack of stability in this patronage made it more sought after and struggled for; a patron was almost as essential as a publisher, and the compe-

1

tition for the favor of the great was very keen. Consequently, the productions show evidence of a bid for continued favor rather than an appeal to judgment and literary taste; eulogizing to an extreme and artificial degree was then common. And so besides the influence of tradition, patronage in Elizabeth's day was necessary for literary production, but the tie was weakened.

Dedications were frequently made to complete strangers. Thus, little could be expected from the mere acceptance of a dedication, more than a sum of money, usually the fee being equal to ten or twelve pounds, present money. However, the recognition by a great man was of more value than the monetary reward. Names of great people were sometimes attached to books and their permission asked afterwards, a custom much frowned upon by the satirists. Gosse² thinks that the dedication was more often a form of thanks for services rendered, as Giles Fletcher in 1593, when he presented his Licia to Lady Molyneux, says distinctly it is in return for favors shown

-
1. Dr. Johnson called the publisher the "patron of literature". In early times the patron assumed the function of publisher.
 2. Gosse, E. "Elizabethan Dedications of Books" Harpers, CV, p. 165.

him by her husband. He maintains that in these days the desire of the poet was for protection and not for money. In a time when the court might at any moment fall upon an author, a powerful patron was of the greatest importance. On the other hand, Holzknecht states that expectation of a reward for dedications continued in the time of the Renaissance, though it was a poor paying business in Elizabethan England. It was no doubt an advantage to have a book launched under the approbation of a person of rank, but the needy writer looked for a more substantial reward in return for a flattering dedication. Occasionally, the reward might be an appointment to some office, but usually a gift of money, though sometimes "mere acceptance of the dedication must have been the only 'solatium'".¹

One Richard Robinson, a compiler and translator of religious works left a record of his literary earnings, and we find that in 1579 Sir Philip Sidney gave him four angels in return for a presentation, but for another work dedicated to Queen Elizabeth and

1. Cambridge History of English Literature,
Vol. IV, p. 445.

presented to her one morning on her way to Chapel, he received nothing and was even told by her that she had enough to do to pay her needy soldiers.¹

It was rare that a poet presented his work to a great man of letters. One William Smith in 1596 dedicated his Chloris to Edmund Spenser, and Daniel dedicated in 1602 his Musophilus to Sir Fulke Greville, but this latter was to the nobleman rather than to the poet.

One patron was usually enough for each book, but the first edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene, 1590, was presented to Queen Elizabeth with a superb dedication and was also protected by an epistle in prose to Sir Walter Raleigh; in addition to these, as many as seventeen sonnets of dedication to others such as the Lord Chancellor, the Lord High Chamberlain, the Great Master of the Horse, the Lord High Admiral, and other renowned personages, were added.

If a writer addressed his work to royalty itself, from whom no private favors could reasonably

1. Cambridge History, Vol. IV, p. 450.

be expected, unless the poet had already secured a post at court, he usually added a dedication to some lord from whom he could hope for a practical recognition. So Samuel Daniel dedicated his History of England to the Queen, but added a more moving address to Lord Rochester.

The language of these dedications was extravagant, often to the point of being grotesque. Nor was it always the humble and timid writer who displayed false humility in these addresses to patrons and particularly to royal ones. These dedications bring out clearly the struggles, terrors, and comforts of writers of Elizabethan England.

The servility displayed and the harm arising from dedication were criticized by writers of the time. Bacon said: "Neither is the modern dedication of books and writing, as to patrons to be commended: for that books (such as are worthy of the name of books) ought to have no patrons but truth and reason."¹ Shakespeare mentioned the abuses in the system in Timon of Athens:

1. Shakespeare's England, Vol. II, Oxford, 1917, p. 208.

"When we for recompense have praised the vile,
It stains the glory in that happy verse
Which aptly sings the good."

Ben Jonson, famous for his attitude of independence toward the public, was almost alone in the dignity of his dedications. He never stooped to flattery. As Wheatley says, "He never forgets what is due to himself while praising patrons."¹ However, Jonson dedicated few books to any particular person. The Book of Epigrams was addressed to the Earl of Pembroke, the friend of poets, who sent Jonson every New Year's Day a gift of twenty pounds with which to buy books. In an epistle to Sir Edward Sackville, Jonson derides those patrons who dispense favors with arrogance, generally to undeserving authors who repay them with ingratitude.

Sometimes a personal tie prompted the choice of a certain man as patron, but many of the dedications "fail to reveal any reason why they should be made to one man rather than another".² At the

-
1. Wheatley, H. B. Dedication of Books to Patron and Friend, New York, 1887, p. 70.
 2. Shakespeare's England, Vol. II, p. 184.

beginning of Elizabeth's reign, signs of the promiscuous dedication of later years were not evident, but, though the situation appeared to be much the same as in the reign of Henry VIII, the conditions were gradually changing with the influx of writers from all classes.

The courtier did not regard writing as a profession, though it might be his main occupation. As De Selincourt observes, "Poetry was a noble pastime, even a vocation, but for a gentleman it was not a profession."¹ Wyatt, Surrey, and Sidney were "dilettante" in the very best sense of the term; their works of course were not intended for publication. "The early poems of Spenser were moves in the difficult game of preferment."²

Prominent among those who patronized literature was Sir Philip Sidney, one of the best and most generous of patrons. Perhaps his real sympathy for the struggling man of letters was the result of his own bitter experiences.³ He gave great encouragement

-
1. De Selincourt, E. Introduction to Spenser's Poetical Works, Oxford, 1929, p. xxi.
 2. Shakespeare's England, Vol. II, p. 185.
 3. He had once asked Sir Charles Hatton to befriend him in a suit to the Queen.

by his example. Spenser acknowledged his earliest and most influential patron:

"Who first my Muse did lift out of the flore,
To sing his sweet delights in lowlie laies."

Sidney was regarded with real affection, and his untimely death on the field of Zutphen was lamented by both those who had known him and those who had only known of him. Nashe was one of the latter class who expressed his grief, which was a universal grief.

A patron who ranked with the Queen in importance was Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. Florio stated with emphasis when he presented that nobleman First Fruits, 1578, that he was "the onely furtherer, maintayner, and supporter of all well disposed mindes toward any kinde of studie".¹ Spenser's allegory, Mother Hubberds Tale, does not hide the name of his benefactor, and Florio called the Earl thrice fortunate in having such a herald of his virtues as Edmund Spenser. In his preface to Second Fruits, Florio says: "Courteous Lord, Courteous Spenser, I know not which hath purchased more fame either he in deserving well of so famous a scholar, or so

1. Shakespeare's England, Vol. II, p. 189.

famous a scholar in being so thankful without hope¹
of requital to so famous a Lord."

Arthur Golding's rendering of Ovid's Metamorphoses, 1565, was dedicated to Leicester in prose and in 1567 his praises were repeated in a verse epistle to the complete translation. Gabriel Harvey devoted the second book of his Congratulationes Valdenenses, 1578, to his praises. Upon his appointment as Chancellor of the University of Oxford, Thomas Cooper dedicated to him the great Latin-English dictionary, Thesaurus Linguae Romanae and Britannicae, 1565. John Stow found Leicester's acceptance of Summarie of Englyshe Chronicles, 1565, so agreeable that he chose the same patron for his Chronicles of England, 1580. Geoffrey Whitney, when dedicating to his Earl his Choice of Emblemes, 1586, states that many famous men had been enabled to pursue their studies through his aid. In his lengthy dedication, which is notable for its attempt to describe the history of patronage, Whitney tells in particular Leicester's services to literature:

1. Einstein, Lewis, The Italian Renaissance in England, New York, 1902, p. III.

"For leavings your native countrie,
 where so manie godlie and vertuous are coun-
 tenanced: So manie learned advaunced, and
 so manie studious incouraged by your honour.
 What other countrie in Christendome, but
 knoweth that your lordship is a ... lovinge
 patron of learninge, and a bountiful Mecenas
 to all the professors of worthie artes, and
 sciences: whereof my selfe is a witnes, who
 have often harde the same in other countries,
 to your everlasting memorie Divers who
 are nowe famous men, had bin, throughe pover-
 tie longe since discouraged from their stu-
 dies: if they had not founde your honour,
 so prone to bee their patron."¹

Though he patronized the Puritan controversialists,
 Leicester showed characteristic inconsistency in
 his active interest in the drama; the "Earl of
 Leicester's Players" were for many years the most
 prominent acting company. His patronage of Gold-
 ing's and also of Horne's translation of Calvin's
 sermons show his leanings towards the Puritans.
 The diversity of his interests is evident in the
 dedications of James Rowbothum's Pleasaunt and
Wittie Playe of the Cheasts, 1562, Thomas Gale's
Certaine Workes of Chirurgerie, 1563, North's
Morall Philosophie of Doni, 1570, and Mulcaster's
First Part of the Elementarie, 1582.

1. Shakespeare's England, Vol. II, pp. 189-90.

An instance of a change of patron for a second edition while the benefactor still lived is to be seen in the case of James Sanford, who inscribed The Garden of Pleasure, 1573, to Leicester and offered the second edition under a slightly changed title, 1576, to Sir Christopher Hatton. This was probably due to disappointed expectation in the bounty of the earl.

The friends of Leicester seemed to feel sure of his sympathy and understanding whatever the nature of their work. A last tribute to this patron of letters was the dedication to his memory of the miscellany, The Phoenix Nest, 1593. Leicester seemed to be a universal patron.

Probably the Earl of Essex was the successor of Leicester as popular patron about 1590. Essex was given a place in the group of seventeen to whom Spenser dedicated a prefatory sonnet to the Faerie Queene. Savola in his Practice says that Essex was a man "whose encouragement of letters has wone for him the title of the Students' ¹Maecenas".

1. Einstein, Lewis, The Italian Renaissance in England, p. 111.

Another poet spoke of him as "England's cedar,
 sprung up to preserve the ¹humblest in all pro-
 fessions with your shadow." A cultivated and
 accomplished man, Essex was a poet himself, in
 intervals of other pursuits, and was an intelli-
 gent patron of learning. He was Bacon's friend,
 bestowing upon that ambitious man an estate valued
 at eighteen hundred pounds.

Burghley did not so scatter his interests;
 poets received no encouragement from him. Spenser
 referred to him in the Fourth Book of the Faerie
Queene when his hopes for advancement had been
 given up:

"The rugged forehead that with grave
 foresight
 Welds kingdomes, causes, and affairs of
 state,
 My looser rimes (I wote) doth sharply
 wite,
 For praising love, as I have done of late.
 * * * * *
 To such therefore I do not sing at all,
 But to that sacred Saint my soveraigne
 Queene."

-
1. Gosse, E., "Elizabethan Dedication of Books",
Harpers Magazine, Vol. 105, p. 165.

The dedications to him of Holinshed's Chronicles and Camden's Britannia were evidences of the favor Burghley bestowed upon historians. Lyly, too, enjoyed his patronage.

The Earl of Southampton was the friend as well as patron of Shakespeare. He was acknowledged as one of the chief patrons of the age because of his appreciation of literary effort of almost every quality and form, though his fame rests, and naturally so, on the fact that he was the only patron Shakespeare is known to have had. There is quoted¹ in Shakespeare's England an incident that, if true, is an unexampled generosity on the part of a patron. Lord Southampton is said to have given the poet "a thousand pounds to enable him to go through with a purchase which he heard he had a mind to".²

Southampton cherished a passion for literature from early youth. Throughout the distractions of a life at court, filled with vicissitudes, his literary

-
1. From Rowe's Life of Shakespeare.
 2. Shakespeare's England, Vol. II, p. 208.

interests can be traced in various correspondence. He was most active as a patron before he attained his twenty-eighth year. Through Florio, his Italian tutor, his acquaintance included all men of literary reputation. However, only a few works seem to be dedicated solely to this nobleman. One of these is Nashe's Unfortunate Traveler, 1594, but "for some unknown reason and contrary to the usual custom, the¹ dedication was withdrawn in the second edition". It was dedicated to the earl as a "dear lover of the poets as the poets themselves".² The patron described at the end of Pierce Penilesse may or may not be Southampton. "The right Honorable the lord S." has only the first letter of his name and that evidence is not strong enough.

In 1595 Gervase Markham dedicated his patriotic poem on Grenville's fight off the Azores to Southampton. He goes far in his adulation and asserts that the sweetness of his lips, which stilled the music

-
1. Shakespeare's England, Vol. II, p. 200.
 2. Lee, Sidney, Life of Shakespeare, New York, 1909, p. 664.

of the spheres, delighted the ear of Almighty God.

"Thou glorious laurel of the Muses' hill
Whose eye doth crown the met victorious pen,
Bright lamp of virtue in whose sacred skill
Lives all the bliss of ear-enchancing men,
From graver subjects of thy grave assays,
Bend thy courageous thoughts unto these lines -
The grave from whence my humble Muse doth raise
True honour's spirit in his rough designs
And when the stubborn stroke of my harsh song
Shall seasonless glide through Almighty ears
Vouchsafe to sweet it with thy blessed tongue
Whose well-tuned sound stills music in the spheres,
So shall my tragic lays be blest by thee¹
And from thy lips suck their eternity."

When Florio acknowledged the earl's "pay and patronage" in his dedication of World of Wordes, 1598, his words are more restrained. He gives Southampton his place in letters saying, "as to me and many more the glorious and gracious sunshine of your honour hath infused light and life."²

One of the many eulogies lavished upon him is "to be found only in a book of such extreme rarity that it may confidently be presumed that it now for the first time offers itself to the notice of modern readers."³ Mr. Lodge refers to The Mirrour of

1. Ibid, p. 666.

2. Ibid.

3. Lodge, Edmund, Portraits of Illustrious Personages of Great Britain, Vol. IV, London, 1835, "Henry Wriothesley" p. 10. The praises that follow are probably not so rare now, but they are interesting nevertheless.

Majestie, or the Badges of Honour conceitedly em-
blazoned; with Emblems annexed, poetically un-
folded; by H. G. 1618. Under the arms of the Earl
of Southampton are these lines:

"No storme of troubles, or cold frost of friends,
Which on free greatness too too oft attends,
Can by presumption threaten your free state;
For these presaging sea-birds do amate
Presumptuous greatnes, moving the best mindes
By their approach to feare the future windes
Of all calamitie, no lesse than they
Portend to seamen a tempestuous day;
Which you foreseeing may beforehand crosse,
As they do them, and so prevent the losse."

On the opposite page is the following compliment:

"What coward stoicke or blunt captaine will
Dislike this union, or not labour still
To reconcile the arts and victory?
Since in themselves arts have this quality,
To vanquish error's traine; what other then
should love the arts, if not a valiant man?
Or how can he resolve to execute
That hath not first learn'd to be resolute?
If any shall oppose this, or dispute
Your great example shall their spite confute."

Upon his death in 1624, eulogies appeared in
which his "globe of worth and eke his vertues brave"
were sung. Daniel and Davies praised him at length.
George Chapman, Joshua Sylvester, Richard Braith-
waite, George Wither and Sir John Beaumont acknow-
ledged his worth. As a whole, however, Southampton's
patronage of literature was rather small.

William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, was the friend of Donne and of Jonson, who said that this patron had "led forth so many good and great names to their remembrance and posterity." The Earl and his brother, Philip, Earl of Montgomery, were frequently the recipients of dedications in partnership.¹ Perhaps the first book dedicated to Pembroke himself is Francis Davison's Poetical Rapsody, 1602. Daniel, about this time, inscribed The Defence of Ryme to him. From then on he assumed the traditional duties of patronage from his mother, the Countess of Pembroke. Not until about 1610, however, did he reach full importance as a patron.

In 1611 Chapman gave him in the dedicatory sonnet to the Iliad the title of "the learned and most noble patron of learning". The publisher, John Budge, said in inscribing the first separate edition of Harington's Epigrams to the earl,

-
1. For example, Ducci's Ars Aulica or The Courtier's Arts, 1607; Stephen's A World of Wonders, 1607; Gerardo, the Unfortunate Spaniard, Leonard Digge's translation from the Spanish, 1622; Folio edition of Shakespeare's plays, dedicated by Heming and Condell, 1623.

"Your Sidneian blood and your famed favor to now
despised Poesie, challenges the dedication of
these Epigrams."¹ Ben Jonson dedicated to Pem-
broke his favourite play Catiline, 1611, and what
he called "the ripest of my studies", the Epigrams,
1616.

William Browne, who in later life lived at
the Pembroke home, Wilton, presented the second
book of Britannia's Pastorals, 1616, to Pembroke,

" that rare Lord, who judge and
guerdon can¹
The richer gifts which do advantage man."

Donne, George Herbert, and William Vaughan, who dedi-
cated to Pembroke the sixth edition of his Directions
for Health, 1626, were other friends and proteges.
As Chancellor of the University of Oxford where Pem-
broke College bears his name, other books of various
types were dedicated to him - Nathanael Carpenter's
Geography delineated forth in two bookes, bk. 1,
1625, for example. John Florio, the lexicographer
and translator, who was earlier the friend of South-
ampton, became in later years a beneficiary of the

1. Shakespeare's England, Vol. II, p. 203.

Earl of Pembroke. Wyndham makes the statement¹ that William Herbert received more dedicatory verses from poets who were also playwrights than any other noble of the time except Southampton.

The sister of Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, carried on the encouragement of poets in memory of her brother, but for her own accomplishments was regarded as his representative and had dedications made to her. Sir Philip Sidney, who idolized this sister, had dedicated to her his celebrated romance written at her request and therefore called The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia. All the famous persons of the day came to Wilton and its mistress' taste for versifying was encouraged by the companionship of poets. Mr. Lodge says that she "seemed to be spoiled, as a poet, by adulation and complimented into self-conceit and carelessness."²

-
1. Wyndham, George, Essays in Romantic Literature, London, 1919, p. 277.
 2. Lodge, E. Portraits of Illustrious Personages, "Mary Sidney" Vol. IV, p. 8.

She was a favourite subject for the poets praises. Hungry authors met her poetic attempts with simulated delight; one of them gravely declares that he doesn't name her in order not to "dishonour with his pen her whom he cannot blazon enough." Other poets praise her more temperately. Spenser says:

"The gentlest shepherdess that liv' that day,
And most resembling, both in shap and spirit,
Her brother dear."

Of Spenser's relation to this patron, more will be said later.

Mr. Wheatley states that a privately printed volume, Praefaces, Dedications, and Epistles by Mr. Huth contains five dedications to the Countess¹ of Pembroke varying in date from 1591 to 1609. Thomas Howell, a retainer of the Pembroke family, dedicated his Device, 1581, to the Countess; Abraham Fraunce, friend of Sidney and Spenser, found her a patron of The Lamentations of Amytas ... translated out of Latine into English Hexameters, 1588,

1. Wheatley, H.B. Dedication of Books, p. 58.

The Countess of Pembroke's Emanuell, 1591, and The Countess of Pembroke's Iyechurch, 1591.¹

Nicholas Breton, probably in the service of Sidney and his sister, acclaims her in The Pilgrimage to Paradise, 1592, "How shall I, the abject of fortune, unto the object of honour presume to offer so simple a present as the poeticall discourse of a poor pilgrimes travaille?"² He continues in this strain, always in the manner of a timid dependent. In his dedications can be traced his falling in and out of his patron's graces. Nashe addressed her in his preface to Sidney's Astrophel and Stella as "eloquent secretary to the Muses, most rare Countesse of Pembroke ... whom artes doe adore as a second Minerva, our poets extoll as the Patronesse of their invention." Drayton's Idea, the Shepheard's Garland, 1593, has its sixth eclogue devoted in theme to a panegyric of Pandora,³ who probably stands for the Countesse of Pembroke. Even Thomas Kyd felt her influence: he followed her example in translating Garnier's Marc-Antoine and made a translation of

-
1. Shakespeare's England, Vol. II, p. 198.
 2. Wheatley, H. B. Dedication of Books, p. 58.
 3. Cambridge History, Vol. IV, p. 198.

Garnier's Corneille, though it is not shown that she evinced any interest in this.

Samuel Daniel knew her best and spoke of her in the highest terms. He looked upon her home as his best school, and never forgot her help. In dedicating Delia to her, he said: "I desire onely to bee graced by the countenance of your protection; whom the fortune of our time hath made the happie and iudiciall Patronesse of the Muses (a glory hereditary to your house) to preserve them from those hideous Beastes, Oblivion and Barbarisme."¹ The prose was replaced by a sonnet in the second edition in 1594. At the command of the Countess he wrote Cleopatra, 1594, as a companion to her tragedy Antonie and glorified her in verse in its dedication. He felt himself forever bound to her and her family.

The Countess of Pembroke was surrounded by a group who clung to Sidney's beliefs as expressed in his Apologie, and included in its numbers was

1. Shakespeare's England, Vol. II, p. 199.

Sidney's devoted friend, Fulke Greville.

Ladies were frequently the ones addressed in dedications. Margaret, Countess of Cumberland, whom Daniel praised, was a prominent patron. The Elizabeth Careys, mother and daughter, were frequently addressed. Spenser claimed relationship in the dedication of his poem Mulopotmos and Nashe dedicated his Terrors of the Night, 1594, to the daughter, Elizabeth. Spenser's poems and the dedications of Florio's translation of Montaigne give the names of six noble ladies, among whom is the name of Lucy, Countess of Bedford, one of the most liberal and universal patrons of poets and learned men of her day. She was lauded by Drayton, Daniel, Jonson, Chapman, and Donne.

An interesting fact in this connection is the kind of qualities praised in the ladies. Robert Toft in 1597, presenting his Laura to Lucy, Countess of Northumberland, praised her "most resolute staidness and the resolved courage of a true Percy." In 1598 he dedicated another poem to Sir Calisthenes Brooke and compliments that soldier on his "lovely face." "This is typically Elizabethan; the lady

praised for her courage and the gentleman for
his 'lovely face'.¹

Other patrons were: Sir Christopher Hatton;
the Earl of Oxford, to whom Lyly dedicated Euphues;
Lord Charles Howard of Effingham; Lord Hunadon;
Sir Walter Raleigh; and Sir Francis Walsingham,
whose death was lamented by Watson in Meloboeus.
Edward Blunt, a bookseller, dedicated the post-
humous edition of Marlowe's Hero and Leander to
Walsingham, for the latter had befriended Marlowe
by giving him refuge when the poet was under arrest.

Most dedications in the Elizabethan Age were
the work of the author, but there are numerous in-
stances where the publisher performs the office of
dedicator. Modern copyright laws had not been e-
volved, and whoever in the sixteenth or seventeenth
century possessed a manuscript was thus the owner.
The signing of a dedication was a title to clear
ownership in the publication. In some cases, where
the author had died, the relatives either did not

1. Gosse, E. "Elizabethan Dedications of Books"
Harpers Magazine, Vol. 105, p. 165.

assert their rights or relinquished them; in other instances, an author's absence from London during the publication of his work might leave the publisher with the task of writing the dedication. Lee says only one of two suggestions is possible when a publisher's name closes a dedication:

"Either the author was ignorant of the publisher's design, or he had refused to countenance it and was¹ openly defied." However, whether one was an author or publisher, his motive in choosing a literary patron was personal gain.

Dedications of Shakespeare's time usually consisted of two distinct parts. There was a dedicatory epistle, which might touch at any length in either verse or prose on the subject of the book and the writer's relation with his patron, but also there was in most cases a preliminary salutation confined to a single sentence. An example of this latter address is that of Michael Drayton's to his patron prefixed to Idea, 1593: "To the most noble and valorous gentleman Master Robert Dudley, enriched with all the vertues of the minde and worthy

1. Lee, Sidney, A Life of Shakespeare, N.Y. 1916, p. 670.

of all honorable desert. Your most affectionate¹
and devoted Michael Drayton."

Often a book had several patrons, as has been observed. A new edition was dedicated to a new patron if the first one had died in the interval; this was not always a "device of mere adventurers in the search for rewards". However, a disgruntled author did not always wait for his patron's death.

Lee is of the opinion that the usual note of the Elizabethan sonnet is one of real affection toward his patron. "Elizabethan sonnets to patrons commonly echo that affectionate note which the Tuscan master struck in his famous sonnet to his friend and patron Colonna - a note which was often afterwards developed by his Italian and French, no less than by his English disciples, into a paen of impassioned devotion to Maecenas."²

Marston, the dramatist, was a cynic who did the unusual thing of dedication to himself the Scourge of Villainy. George Wither in his Abuses Stript

1. Ibid, p. 676.

2. Lee, Sidney, Elizabethan Sonnets, Vol. I, English Garner, Introduction p. cix.

and Whipt did the same thing. They evidently scorned the fawning attitude of many of their contemporaries, and felt they could look only to themselves for making opportunities for advancement.¹

As the patrons had numerous proteges, it is natural that the extent of their patronage, in many cases, was limited and temporary. Jonson, Drayton, and Joshua Sylvester received annuities from the Crown, but the sums of one hundred, ten, and twenty pounds received by them respectively were not sufficient without other means of income.² Maintenance at the University, bestowed upon promising youths, was another form of bounty. Official appointment was the least burdensome method. Some patrons hospitably housed the ones they were befriending.³ Nashe, Donne, and even Jonson and Spenser for a time were beneficiaries

-
1. Wheatley, H. B. Dedication of Books, p. 45.
 2. These sums must be multiplied by five, for the purchasing power of Elizabethan coinage was five times that of the present day.
 3. Sheavyn, Phoebe, Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age, pp. 18-19.

1

of this kind of patronage. Money gifts and pensions were also frequent forms of remuneration.

The bounty was insufficient, however, as evidenced by the grumblings of the scholars. Nashe, Barnfield, Churchyard, and even Daniel complained of the coldness and selfishness of the wealthy. Spenser's keenest humiliation was received when he went to place his Paerie Queene before Elizabeth. The sharpness of the hurt to his pride is brought out in Mother Hubberds Tale in the words of the suitor at the Queen's court:

"Most miserable man, whom wicked fate
Hath brought to court, to sue for bad yvist
That few have found and manie one hath mist!
* * * * *
To fawne, to crouch, to waite, to ride, to
ronne,
To spend, to give, to want, to be undone.
Unhappy wight borne to disastrous end,
That doth his life in so long tendance spend!"²

An evil resulting from the striving for favor was sordid rivalry. Apologies are evident in some of the writing for pandering to the taste of the patron in a choice of theme. Struggling authors

-
1. Sir Robert Drury offered Donne and his family a home with him in his splendid mansion beyond Temple Bar. Jonson lived for five years as guest of Lord Aubigny, Duke of Lennox.
 2. Spenser's Poetical Works, ed. Smith, J.C. and De Selincourt, E. Oxford, 1929, p. 504.

would go to almost any lengths in order to secure a patron. Then in order to keep them, many writers assumed the character of a cringing servant in addressing them. Massinger was always self-effacing in his attitude toward the rich whose patronage he craved. This moral weakness was caused by the struggle for a livelihood.

Such a crowd of needy writers was naturally a source of annoyance to the average man of wealth. Only a person with discriminate taste, such as Sidney, could distinguish between the genuine and the false. The patron had reason to be cautious in lending his favor to the flattery of unknown writers. The trick of furnishing several copies of the same book with dedications to different patrons who might believe themselves the sole dedicatee was a common¹ trick of the time. A dedication was sometimes printed without a heading, which could be supplied in writing: the recipient in these cases was not to assume that he was the only patron. This method, though convenient for the making of personal gifts, was open to fraud. Thus trickery was added to the

1. Sheavyn, Phoebe, The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age, pp. 36-37.

evils resulting from patronage. Much patronage was with-held or so grudgingly given that many of the complaints from the authors were justifiable. Such a situation was almost unavoidable where many writers were unscrupulous. Thus the system of patronage slowly died, but not without a struggle.

CHAPTER III

Two Outstanding Elizabethans and Their Patrons

CHAPTER III
TWO OUTSTANDING ELIZABETHANS AND THEIR
PATRONS

In the study of patronage of this period, we should find particularly interesting the attitude of the two greatest writers, Shakespeare and Spenser, to their patrons. It is natural to ask, Did the outstanding figures in literature have the same fears and resort to the same methods as the minor writers? We shall, then, study here the relation of these men to their patrons, the type of protection they received, and the influence it exerted on them and on their work.

I. Shakespeare.

It was probably soon after the performance of Shakespeare's earliest original play, "Love's Labour's Lost", 1591, that he attracted the attention of the young Earl of Southampton, one of the most accomplished of the Queen's courtiers. Southampton appears to have been extremely interested in

the theatre.¹ Lee feels that it was probably at the suggestion of his enthusiastic patron that, in the week preceding Christmas of 1594, Shakespeare was summoned to court to give his sovereign a taste² of his work as playwright and actor.

About this time tones of greater warmth toward his patron can be observed in Shakespeare's addresses to him. The formal manner in the dedication of Venus and Adonis to Southampton in 1593 changes within the year to one of great affection in that of Lucrece. The contrast between the two is an interesting one. The former reads as follows:

Right Honourable,

I know not how I shall offend in dedicating my unpolished lines to your lordship, nor how the world will censure me for choosing so strong a prop to support so weak a burthen; only if your honour seem but pleased, I account myself highly praised, and now to take advantage of all idle hours till I have honoured you with some graver labour. But if the first heir of my invention prove deformed, I shall be sorry it had so noble a godfather, and never after ear so barren aland

-
1. Lee, Sidney, Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century, New York, 1904, p. 265. "The earl was said to spend nearly all his leisure time at the playhouse."
 2. Ibid.

for fear it yield me still so bad a harvest.
 I leave it to your honourable survey, and
 your honour to your heart's content, which
 I wish may always answer your own wish and
 the world's hopeful expectation,

Your Honour's in all duty,
 William Shakespeare¹

His intimacy with Southampton is attested by
 his own hand in the second dedication a year later,
 prefixed to Lucrece.

Right Honourable,

The love I dedicate to your lordship is
 without end; whereof this pamphlet without be-
 ginning, is but a superfluous moiety. The
 warrant I have of your honourable disposition,
 not the worth of my untutored lines, makes it
 assured of acceptance. What I have done is
 yours; what I have to do is yours; being
 part in all I have, devoted yours. Were my
 worth greater, my duty would show greater;
 meantime, as it is, it is bound to your lord-
 ship, to whom I wish long life, still length-
 ened with all happiness.

Your lordship's in all duty,
 William Shakespeare²

As this was the last book Shakespeare published, he
 had no occasion to refer to Southampton by name
 again.

The most famous dedication in all literature is
 the one Thomas Thorpe prefixed to Shakespeare's
Sonnets, 1609.

-
1. Shakespeare's Complete Works, ed. Craig, W. J.,
 Oxford, 1926, p. 1244.
 2. *Ibid*, p. 1259.

To The Onlie Begetter of
 These Inuving Sonnets
 Mr. W.H. All Happiness
 And That Eternitie
 Promised
 By
 Ovr Ever-Living Poet
 Wisheth
 The Well-Wishing
 Adventurer In
 Setting
 Forth

T. T.¹

This Thomas Thorpe was a stationer who was a kind of literary agent picking up stray "copy". A manuscript of Shakespeare's Sonnets fell into his hands and he published them prefixing this confused dedication. Lee feels that it can be safely assumed that the poet received no notice of Thorpe's intention of publishing the sonnets, and thus through his ignorance, the dedication was signed by the "well-wishing adventurer in setting forth".² The stationer left the conventional salutation to stand alone, not including the usual dedicatory epistle, but he was too self-assertive to omit high-sounding, bombastic words. As it was his custom to include in the common

-
1. Shakespeare's Complete Works, ed. Craig, W. J., Oxford, 1926, p. 1281.
 2. Lee, Sidney, A Life of William Shakespeare, p. 670.

formula some pretentious addition suggested by the Author's writing, he added here a reference to the immortality which Shakespeare, like contemporary sonneteers, prophesied for his verse.

The bookseller prepared here a battlefield for the future with his mysterious "W.H." Was it for Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton to whom Shakespeare had himself dedicated Venus and Adonis and The Rape of Lucrece - the letters in this case could be a transposition - or was it for William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke? The idea of Pembroke's identification with the "W.H." of the Sonnets is regarded as "at best a wild conjecture"¹ by some, though Mr. Wheatley asserts that it is the popular view.²

A person of wealth and social influence would be valuable in launching any book, but sometimes the publisher went farther afield in his search of a dedicatee and chose a personal friend who had aided him in some commercial transaction and who would

-
1. Shakespeare's England, Vol. II, p. 202.
 2. Wheatley, H. B. Dedications of Books, p. 75.

appreciate a dedication. Thus Lee is confident that the mysterious "Mr. W.H." as patron of the Sonnets could have been chosen by Thorpe in the "everyday prosaic conditions of current literary traffic".¹ This author disposes very definitely with the theory that the earl could be the patron. Referring to the dedication of the First Folio edition, 1623, prepared by Shakespeare's fellow-actors,² he says the conventional phrasing "proves no private sort of friendship"³ with the peer whom no one came near except in a kind of religious address. The dedication to Pembroke and his brother shows interest no greater than was generally taken in the performance of Shakespeare's plays. The Sonnets give no evidence in themselves of any acquaintance of Shakespeare and Pembroke; the characteristics of the youth of the poems, the

-
1. Lee, Sidney, A Life of William Shakespeare, p. 671.
 2. It was addressed to "the most noble and incomparable paire of brethern, William, Earl of Pembroke, etc., Lord Chamberlain to the King's most excellent Majesty, and Philip, Earl of Montgomery, etc., Gentleman of his Majesties Bedchamber. Both Knights of the Most Noble Order of the Garter and our singular good Lords."
 3. Lee, Sidney, Life of Shakespeare, p. 687, ff.

circumstances of his life parallel in no way those of Pembroke.

1

Schelling holds this view also. He feels that no one would have dared to so missaddress the Earl of Pembroke. This difficulty of identification is only a bookseller's matter, this writer believes. He mentions the fact that several critics, mostly German, make the "Mr. W.H." stand for "William Himself," a strange idea certainly.

Whether or not Shakespeare's sonnets are regarded in the light of biographical references, many of them give evidence of the relations in which he stood to a patron and the place he tried to fill in the circle of that patron's proteges. It is clear that Shakespeare had only one patron² and that the Earl of Southampton.

-
1. Schelling, Felix E. English Literature During the Lifetime of Shakespeare, New York, 1927, p. 141.
 2. Ibid. Schelling feels there is "nothing irrational in supposing that William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, was likewise at some time the poet's patron" particularly since Shakespeare's friends, Heming and Condell, thought Pembroke, with his brother, the Earl of Montgomery, a suitable person to whom to dedicate the Folio edition of the dramatist's works.

"Sing (O Muse!) to the ear that doth thy
 lays esteem,
 And gives thy pen both skill and argument"
 (c 7-8)

"For to no other pass my verses tend
 Than of your graces and your gifts to tell."
 (ciii. 11-12)¹

Twenty of Shakespeare's sonnets (23, 26, 32, 37, 38, 69, 77-86, 100, 101, and 106) Lee says are definitely "dedicatory". Three of these (26, 32, and 38) "merely translate into the language of poetry ... the accepted expression of devotion which had already done duty in the dedicatory epistle in prose that prefaces Lucrece."¹ The central theme is that the patron may claim the poet's work, as he inspires it; these lines of Sonnet 38 are typical of the usual dedicatory praise:

"For who's so dumb that cannot write to thee
 When thou thyself dost give invention light?"

* * * * *

If my light Muse do please these curious days, 2
 The pain be mine, but thine shall be the praise."

Barnabe Barnes was probably Shakespeare's greatest rival for the favor of the patronage of Southampton. He praised his patron's eyes, "those heavenly lamps", the

-
1. Lee, Sidney, A Life of William Shakespeare, p. 197 ff.
 2. Shakespeare's Complete Works, Oxford, 1928, p. 1287.

only true source of poetic inspiration. Shakespeare refers magnanimously to his rival as a "worthier pen" compared to whom he is a "worthless boat". Though some critics consider this rival to be Markham or Nashe, Lee asserts that "Shakespeare's description of his rival's literary work fits far less closely the verse of Markham and Nashe than the verse of their fellow aspirant Barnes".¹

Still others argue that George Chapman was the genius whose influence on his patron Shakespeare feared. But his "great verse" did not appear until he began his translation of Homer in 1598 and, although his sonnet to Southampton is added to a complete edition of his work, it was strictly formal and suggests no intimate friendship. Drayton, Ben Jonson, and Marston have also been suggested as "the rival poet" but none of these benefited by Southampton's favors, nor does the description in the sonnets seem applicable to the work of these men.

As the words "lover" and "friend" were inter-

1. Lee, Sidney, A Life of William Shakespeare, p. 203.

changeable in Elizabethan English, many of Shakespeare's other sonnets have Southampton as their subject though there is no specific reference to the youth as a literary patron. Expressions of love are used by Elizabethan poets in their professional intercourse with those who sympathized and encouraged their literary attempts. This is proved by the mass of verse to the greatest of all Elizabethan patrons - the Queen. The warmth with which they phrase their expressions to her would be misunderstood unless one took into consideration the conventions of the "amorous vocabulary" of the time.

Hence into the passionate avowals of friendship one must read the extravagance of the age. As Lee says, "There can be little doubt that Shakespeare, always susceptible to the contemporary vogue, penned many sonnets equally calculated to flatter the ear of a praise-loving Maecenas like the Earl of Southampton. It is quite possible that beneath all the conventional adulation there lay a genuine affection. But the perfect illusion of passion which often colours Shakespeare's poetic vows of friendship

may well be the fruit of his interpretation of the common usage in the glow of dramatic instinct."¹

Proteges gave their patrons all the perfections of mind and body, all the virtues of the old heroes of whom "antique poets" formerly sang. The language of these praises of Shakespeare's time follows closely that of the Italian poet, Tasso, in his relation to his patron, the Duke of Ferraro. The lover-like attitude is to be found in both. Another close parallel is to be seen in the sonnets of the French poet, Etienne Jodelle, who is desolated in the absence of his patron, pledges eternal constancy, and credits him with a genius unknown in art. So Shakespeare wrote of his hero.

The most striking evidence of the identity of the youth of the sonnets with Southampton is to be found in the similarity of the physical appearance of the poet's description and the extant pictures of the Earl as a young man. There is good reason to believe that most of the sonnets were in process of

1. Ibid, p. 209 ff.

composition in 1594 when Southampton was not yet twenty-one and Shakespeare was thirty. In real life the earl had the birth, wealth, and intellect praised by the poet. The references in all places point to Southampton as the hero. According to Lee, no other peer of the day seems to fit so exactly. Schelling says there are difficulties in the way of either interpretation of the friend of the sonnets - Southampton or Pembroke - but Southampton is "the fairest claimant for the role of Shakespeare's friend and patron".¹

The group of sonnets dealing with intrigue in which "the dark lady" figures, present the poet and youth in a relation hard to reconcile with an author's "idealized worship of a patron". The youth might or might not be identified with the patron-friend of the sonnets of friendship. It must be remembered that this theme of friendship versus love was a commonplace Renaissance problem. There may be a personal note there, but Shakespeare would be con-

1. Schelling, Felix E. English Literature During the Lifetime of Shakespeare, p. 144.

forming to dramatic practice in adapting his story of intrigue from the stock theme of romance.

Upon the earl's release from prison at the accession of James I in 1603, the poets sang their elation. Naturally Shakespeare joined the chorus singing praises to one of the best of patrons. In Sonnet 107 he ends with the words "my love looks fresh" which must refer to his friend whom he promises will live in his "poor rhyme". During the rest of Shakespeare's life he made no reference to his former benefactor. His genius had received the public recognition that made a private patron's favor unnecessary, but the last mention in verse justifies the opinion that their friendship continued the remaining sixteen years of the poet's life. It is certain that the poet never forgot the encouragement received from Southampton in the beginning of his literary career.

The Sonnets prove, according to Lee, that like others of his time and profession, Shakespeare used all the usual weapons of flattery to obtain the patronage of a young nobleman. They give evidence

that the Earl of Southampton, to whom the two narrative poems were openly dedicated, gave Shakespeare the help he needed at an early period.

Shakespeare's Sonnet 25 seems to indicate, I think, his feeling in general in regard to patrons,

"Let those who are in favor with their stars
Of public honor and proud titles boast,
Whilst I, whom fortune of such triumph bars,
Unlooked for joy in that I honor most.
Great Princes' favorites their fair leaves
spread

But as the marigold at the sun's eye,
And in themselves their pride lies buried,
For at a frown they in their glory die.
The painful warrior famoused for fight,
After a thousand victories once foiled
Is from the book of honor razed quite,
And all the rest forgot for which he toiled.
Then happy I, that love and am beloved
Where I may not remove nor be removed."¹

2

Acheson holds that the bulk of the sonnets was written by Shakespeare to the Earl of Southampton between 1592 and 1599 and that the poet had no hand in their publication in 1609. He believes they were collected from their original recipients by John Florio and published by him in collusion with George Chapman and others. Acheson considers that Thorpe

-
1. Shakespeare's Complete Works, Oxford, 1926, p. 1285.
 2. Acheson, Arthur, Shakespeare's Sonnet Story, London, 1922.

was a friend of Florio's, Chapman's, and Jonson who were attacking Shakespeare at the time and therefore it is not possible that "Thomas Thorpe could have been ignorant of the identities of the patron . . . and the only deduction possible regarding the Mr. W.H. of the dedication is that Thorpe and his employers deliberately transposed the initials of Southampton's name and prefixed them by 'Mr.' in order to mystify a curious public; an intention in which they have been eminently successful."¹

II. Spenser

Spenser's first benefactors were men he met during his school years. One of the earliest patrons the poet had was Dr. Young, headmaster of Pembroke College for five of the poet's seven college years. Prior to being headmaster, Young had served in London as chaplain of Grindal, then

1. Ibid, p. 35.

Bishop of London and a former headmaster of Pembroke also. Grindal was one of the public examiners of the Merchant Taylors' School where Spenser studied, and later the poet refers to him in Shepheardes Calender as Algrind. Long feels¹ that both of these men knew Spenser well and that Harvey did not get Spenser his position as Secretary to Dr. Youngin 1578. However, about this time the fortunes of his patrons fell, Grindall getting into difficulty for not suppressing irregular preaching. With Grindal's failure, Young's promotion ended. Thus the need of a patron drew Spenser to Leicester, the powerful favorite of the Queen. Harvey, the poet's closest friend at Cambridge, introduced him to Leicester about 1577² and not later than 1578 Spenser became a member of the Earl's household, Leicester House, as a secretary. That the relation between the poet and patron was easy and amiable is shown by

-
1. Long, P. W., "Spenser and the Bishop of Rochester" PMLA, XXXI, 1916, p. 713.
 2. Ibid. Long takes issue with this belief.

Spenser himself in the Ruines of Time when he says,

"And who so else did goodness gaine?
And who so else his bounteous mind did try?"

"Leicester stands to Spenser in precisely the same relation as the Earl of Southampton stands to Shakespeare."¹

Spenser's connection with Leicester brought him leisure for study and writing, foreign travel, and he was sent abroad with dispatches from his patron, and it brought him acquaintance with Sir Philip Sidney, the brilliant nephew of the Earl. The letters that passed between Spenser and Harvey between 1579 and 1590 give many details of the poet's activities, hopes, and opinions. It is interesting to note that of the two poems - The Shepheardes Calender and the Faerie Queene - on which Spenser's fame mainly depends, the former was completed and the latter well begun while the poet² was under Leicester's roof in 1579.

-
1. Lee, Sidney, Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century, N. Y., 1904, p. 164.
 2. Higginson, James J., Shepheardes Calender in Relation to Contemporary Affairs, New York, 1912, p. 231. He feels that Lobbin in the Calender is the Earl of Leicester; the Queen's name for the Earl was "Sweet Robin" and from a familiar "My Lord Robin" to "Lobbin" was not a far cry.

To Sir Philip Sidney he was soon bound by a tie stronger than that usually between patron and protege. "Spenser's love for Sidney was probably the deepest formative influence upon his life."¹ The modesty of Spenser, who was aware of their inequality in the eyes of the world is evident years later when he dedicated the Ruines of Time to the Countess of Pembroke, the sister of Sidney; he claimed no equality in friendship with "that most brave knight your noble brother deceased". In 1579 when the poet made his first bid for poetic fame in the Shepheardes Calender, he dedicated it to "the President of noblenesse and of chevalrie, Sir Philip Sidney," who bestowed high praise on it. However, this patron and friend censured the poem for one thing, "the rusticke language" used there. That Sidney does not speak at greater length of the Calender in his Defense Baskerville² feels is due to the unpopularity of Spenser following Mother Hubberds Tale.

-
1. De Selincourt, E., Introduction to Spenser's Poetical Works, p. xiii.
 2. Baskerville, C.R., PMLA XXVIII, 1913, p. 309, n. 2.

Gradually the more practical side of Spenser became uppermost. It was necessary for him to bring his talents before the eyes of those who could advance his fortunes. Being in the service of Leicester and on easy terms with Sidney, he seemed to have such help within his grasp. Spenser was a flatterer when it paid him to be such, though as a courtier he blames the manners of the times. That he is cautious and wary is evident in his pondering whether or not to dedicate the Shepheardes Calender to Leicester. In the letter to Harvey, dated October 5, 1580, he asks that pedant's advice. "My principal doubts are these," he says, "First I was minded for a while to have intermitted the uttering of my writings; least by over-much cloying their noble ears, I should gather a contempt for myself, or else seem rather for gaine and commoditie to doe it, for some sweetnesse that I have already¹ tasted."

The facts that the prefatory letter to Harvey was dated April 10 and that when the Calender appeared it was dedicated to Sidney, offer no difficulties.

1. Spenser's Poetical Works, p. 635.

"By October, Spenser had been received with so much favor by Leicester that he contemplated offering his poem to the powerful favorite and sought Harvey's¹ advice."

In the same letter the poet speaks with regret of Gosson's impudent dedication of the School of Abuse, a denunciation of poets, to Sidney, a poet and a lover of poetry. Spenser's words are, "Such follie is it, not to regarde aforehand the inclination and qualitie of him to whom we dedicate oure Bookes. Such mighte I happily incurre entituling My Slomber and the other pamphlets unto his honor. I meant them rather to Maister Dyer."²

Other important details of Spenser's relations with Leicester, Sidney, and Dyer, another friend of these years, are shown in this letter. The poet was apparently happy over his connections, but as Greenlaw says, "he was proceeding with caution, though inclined to dedicate his Calender to Leicester, because of fear of presuming as Gosson had presumed with Sidney."³

-
1. Greenlaw, Edwin, "Spenser and the Earl of Leicester" PMLA, XXV, 1910, p. 535.
 2. Spenser's Poetical Works, p. 635.
 3. Greenlaw, PMLA, XXV, 1910, p. 537.

His intimacy with Sidney is clear when he says,
 "Your desire to heare of my late beeing with her
 Maiestie, muste dye in itselfe. As for the twoo
 worthy gentlemen, Master Sidney and Master Dyer,
 they have me, I thanke them in some use of familiar-
 ity ."¹ And again he remarks with evident pride,
 "As gentle M. Sidney, I thanke his good Worship,
 hath required of me, and so promised to doe againe."²

More important, however, is the following
 passage which shows how Spenser regarded his rela-
 tions with his patron -- even above literature: "I
 was minded also to have sent you some English verses:
 or Rymes for a farewell; but by my Troth, I have no
 spare time in the world to thinke on such Toyes,
 that you know will demaund a freer head, than mine
 is presently. I beseech you by all your Curtesies
 and Graces let me be answered ere I goe: which will
 be, (I hope, I feare, I thinke: the nexte weeke, if
 I can be dispatched of my Lorde. I goe thither, as
 sent by him; and there am to employ my time, my body,

1. Spenser's Poetical Works, p. 635.

2. Ibid, p. 638.

my minde to his Honours service."¹

Spenser is making every effort for preferment; his poetry was a means to that end. However, in the third of these Three Proper and wittie familiar letters, dated April 1580, we find a definitely changed tone. Something had brought Spenser back to his writing. In August he was in Ireland, cut off from the advancement at court he had hoped for. Greenlaw feels that two of Spenser's poems and the circumstances connected with them help us to understand this part of the poet's life.

Leicester was at this time in a difficult position because of the Queen's infatuation for the duc d'Alencon. He was madly jealous; he was leader of the Puritan party and the Puritans themselves were mad with fear that the "unholy alliance" would be carried out. Burghley seemed to be in favor of the match. The emissary of Alencon divulged the secret of Leicester's marriage and the latter was in grave danger, for the Queen viewed the marriage of her favourites with displeasure; she liked tame animals

1. Ibid.

in her court. A strange feature of Elizabeth's relations to her followers was her custom of having names of animals for her admirers. Here is Spenser's connection with the affair. Alencon was her "frog"; Leicester her "lion" or "bear"; Simier her "ape". Near this fantastic circle, backed by the favor of the earl and his nephew, and eager to be of importance at the court stands Spenser. He has in mind a tale of a fox and an ape. "Perhaps it is already written in part, when in this crisis it occurs to him to treat in allegorical fashion this Aesopian Court, in order to show the danger threatening the Queen and his patron."¹ So we have Mother Hubberds Tale (1579-80), a beast-allegory applicable to the crisis at court. There is reason here for the hatred Burghley had for Spenser and grounds for his being sent to Ireland.

Sidney had written a dignified letter to the Queen protesting against her actions and was thereby banished from the royal presence for a time; Spenser

1. Greenlaw, PMLA, XXV, 1910, p. 545.

had the same aim in his allegory, though perhaps less pure a motive, as he wanted to serve Leicester and thereby advance himself.

The situation of the Earl of Leicester was critical and the resentment aroused by his Puritan friends, among whom was Spenser, added to his difficult position. Thus the over-zealous Spenser was not given the favor for which he had hoped, but in the summer of 1580 he was appointed secretary to Lord Grey of Wilton, the new Lord Deputy, and was taken to Ireland. Greenlaw feels that Leicester must have been much relieved.

Long does not take as seriously as Greenlaw the implications of the letters to Harvey of 1579-80. The Elizabethan artifices, he thinks, might have been the reason for many of the statements in regard to Spenser's association with Leicester. Long finds Rochester's influence in Mother Hubberds Tale. One of the Bishop's sermons against ambition is the germ of Spenser's poem, he thinks and goes into great detail in drawing the parallel. Spenser attacks in the July eclogue, Aylmer, then Bishop of London, under

a nickname commonly given Aylmer, by the Puritans. It was a time when such an attack was indiscreet, and so Long concludes: "It is Spenser's faithful adherence to the patrons of his boyhood which conditioned his ecclesiastical satire, particularly his open and imprudent attack on the uncompromising Bishop of London. His rise from the rank of poor scholar, his moral and ecclesiastical ideas, and much of his early poetry were immediately conditioned by his close affiliation with the Bishop of Rochester."¹

Nor can this writer agree to the change of patrons -- from Leicester to Grey -- as a result of Spenser's having displeased Leicester by allusions regarding the French marriage in Mother Hubbard's Tale. The change was due, Long feels, to the same situation as in the case of Dr. Young. Leicester's fortunes were at low ebb because of the discovery of his marriage and "in changing patrons Spenser

1. Long, P. W. "Spenser and Bishop of Rochester" PMLA, 1916, XXXI, p. 735.

had at the moment little to lose."¹

Miss Sheavyn expresses the opinion that it was the influence of Sidney that gained for Spenser the favor of Lord Grey,² a distinguished patron of letters. De Selincourt says that Spenser had no reason to be dissatisfied with his new position for it was a good opening, bringing him into contact with the man "who, next to Sidney, had the deepest and most permanent influence upon his imagination."³

The introductory sonnet to Virgil's Gnat, published in 1591 but "long since dedicated to the most noble and excellent Lord, the Earl of Leicester, late deceased," must refer also to this period.

"Wrong'd yet not daring to expresse my paine,
To you (great Lord) the causer of my care,
In elowdie teare my case I thus complaine
Unto yourselfe, that onely privie are."⁴

The poet feels he is exiled to Ireland because of the service he rendered his patron and thus he expresses the bitterness and injustice of his fate. The revised

1. Ibid, p. 724.
2. Sheavyn, Phoebe, Literary Patronage in Elizabethan Age, Manchester, 1909, p. 37.
3. De Selincourt, Introduction to Poetical Works, p. xxiii.
4. Long, contrary to opinions of others, feels that these words refer to a "secret" faith. PMLA XXXI, 1916, p. 724.

edition of the Tale in 1591 also shows the poet's increased resentment to Burghley because of his disappointed hopes of advancement.

Burghley could have been of more help to Spenser than that statesman's rival, but he was never well understood. He used men to advance his own interests though he was not altogether selfish. Greenlaw is of the opinion that Burghley was never jealous of the talented poet, as many have argued, and that the animosity against Burghley shown in the original form of Mother Hubberds Tale "was due to other than selfish pettiness because Spenser's talents were not appreciated."¹ He desired to defend his patron and aid the Puritan cause only.

Spenser now turned his devotion just as entirely to Lord Grey, championing the same causes. In the View of the Present State of Ireland, the writer to a great extent tries to justify the policy of his patron.

1. Greenlaw, PMLA XXV, p. 561.

In 1589 when Sir Walter Raleigh was in Ireland looking after his estates, he either began or renewed his friendship with Spenser.¹ They were drawn into close intimacy and the restless Raleigh aroused once more Spenser's desire for recognition at court. With the first installment of the Faerie Queene, he sailed with Raleigh for London. Raleigh was not a very good patron where Burghley was still in power and it is not surprising says Jones, "that the fruit of that hopeful journey to London was no more than a pension of fifty pounds a year."²

The following dedication to the Queen was prefixed to the work: "To the most high, mightie, and magnificent Emperesse, renowned for pietie, vertue, and all gratiovs government Elizabeth by the grace

-
1. An interesting disagreement with this view is given by "C", Notes and Queries, Third Series, Vol. IV, p. 66. This writer says that as Raleigh is Timias, Prince Arthur's squire, he must have been Spenser's honoured friend long before April, 1580. Also the three tales of Amoretta, Belpheobe, and Florimell denote Spenser's love and esteem for Raleigh. As the latter visited Ireland in 1589 and took the post back to London with him the third book of the Faerie Queene must have been almost completed and the first is known to have been begun in 1580.
 2. Jones, H. S. V. Spenser Handbook, N. Y. 1930, p. 34.

of God, Queene of England, France, and Ireland,
and of Virginia, defendovr of the faith, etc.

Her most humble servant Edmund Spenser doth in all
humilitie dedicate, present, and consecrate these
his labours to live with the eternitie of her fame.¹

An explanatory letter to Sir Walter Raleigh is attach-
ed and closes with these words which show the atti-
tude of Spenser and this patron: "So humbly craving
the continuance of your honorable fauour towards me,
and th' eternall establishment of your happiness, I
humbly take leave.

Your most humbly affectionate

Ed. Spenser"

Seventeen sonnets addressed to the most important
men of the day were also added. The list makes an
imposing group for a single poem, and the language
of these dedications shows the spirit in which each
was held. De Selincourt sums them up excellently.

"To Sir Christopher Hatton and Lord Burghley he
writes as grave counsellors, the pillars of the state,

1. The dedication in 1596 added the words "and of
Virginia" and "to live with the eternitie
of her fame."

to the Earl of Oxford, the Lord Howard, High Admiral, to Sir John Norreys, as men whose fame he has already eternized, and to Essex as one whose 'heroic parts' will form his future theme. The sonnet to Lord Buckhurst pays fine tribute to 'the lofty numbers and heroick style' of the Induction; he addresses Lord Grey in terms of deep gratitude and personal devotion, and Raleigh as his comrade in song, the 'deare delight' of his sovereign, her soldier and poet. Nor did he forget the memory of him who had first encouraged his art. Sidney was dead; but to 'that most heroick spirit' he pays homage in a sonnet to his sister the Countess of Pembroke. He concludes with addresses to his cousin Lady Carey, and 'to all the gracious and beautiful Ladies in the Court.'¹

Spenser's triumph in the literary world was complete and he enjoyed it to the full, but he expected more than verbal recognition from the court. Lee says, "He patiently suffered rebuffs and dis-

1. De Selincourt, Introduction, Spenser's Poetical Works, p. xxviii.

appointments, delays and the indecision of patrons."¹ It seems definite that Spenser fully expected a position at Court. "There can be no doubt that Spenser anticipated substantial recognition of his poetic fame in the shape of a post of responsibility under the Crown."² But this did not come about, for Burghley was the Queen's trusted Counsellor and a man under the patronage of Leicester and Raleigh and later of Essex, was not to be considered. Finally a pension of fifty pounds a year was bestowed upon him, and "The bestowal of it gave him such prestige as recognition by the Crown invariably confers on a poet, although it did not give Spenser the formal title of poet-laureate."³

But Spenser was dissatisfied and never forgave the attitude of Burghley, the Lord Treasurer.⁴ The pension, however, was worth at least four hundred

-
1. Lee, Sidney, Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century, p. 180.
 2. De Selincourt, Introduction, Spenser's Poetical Works, p. xxix.
 3. Lee, Sidney, Great Englishmen, p. 181.
 4. Quotation from Faerie Queene, Book Four, showing this is given in Chapter II, p. II of this paper.

pounds in our present money, and though much has been said of Elizabeth's stinginess in this instance, De Selincourt is of the opinion that Spenser was better treated than most poets. He had this as a free gift from the Crown who had already given him a gentleman's estate in Ireland.

Spenser's feeling for the darker side of court life was now intensified, and he gave voice to his disgust in his volume of Complaints, assigning to Burghley the cause of the neglect of the arts and degeneracy of the time. In the Ruines of Time he says:

"O let the man of whom the Muse is scorned
Nor alive nor dead be of the Muse adorned."

His early satire of Mother Hubberds Tale was included in this volume, but he added that sad account of the suitor at court.

Among the ladies of the court, Spenser had many friends, and judging from the dedications of many of his poems, he found both friendship and understanding in the company of women. Most critics assume that his extravagant expressions to the Queene are a part of his worship of all women and that his poetic

imagination carried him away when he addressed her. She is a queen of May, a queen of Fairy, Eliza, Gloriana, Belphebe, Britomart, both Diana and Venus. He attributes to her every beauty, no matter what her age. In his Colin Clouts Come Home Again, written when Elizabeth was nearly sixty, Spenser went to the extreme of lyrical madness either in the praise of her physical beauty or¹ in his gratitude for a pension she had granted him. Evidently Spenser used his praises to cover his assaults upon the various phases of the Government, for he attacked almost every act of the Queen. He uses Burghley as the evil genius, however, placing most of the weight of his railings on him.

Chief among the women to whom he dedicated his poems was the Countess of Pembroke. For her he wrote the Ruines of Time,² "speciallie intended to the re-nouncing of that noble race from which both you and he sprong, and to the eternizing of some of them late

1. Legouis, Emile, Ed. Spenser, Paris, 1913, pp. 20-21.

2. "And never was the occasional nature of an elegy more naively expressed", Renwick, W. L. Edmund Spenser, London, 1925, p. 60.

deceased. The which I dedicate unto your La. as
 whome it most especiallie concerneth; and to whome
 I acknowledge my selfe bounded by manie singular
 fauours and great graces. I pray for your honour-
 able happiness and so humblie kisse your hands."¹

In his statement there blaming himself for not
 showing any "thankfull remembrance" towards his
 early patrons of her family, he is not quite accur-
 ate, for as early as 1580 Spenser had written Stem-
mate Dudleiana,² probably very similar to the Ruines
of Time. It is true that Spenser wrote nothing on
 the death of either Sidney, 1586,³ or Leicester,
 1588, and Baskerville suggests that Spenser's re-
 sentment toward Leicester for not supporting him in
 the trouble mentioned in Virgil's Gnat was carried
 over to Sidney also. Astrophel he thinks is "tho-
 roughly perfunctory" and the Ruines of Time an

-
1. Spenser's Poetical Works, p. 471.
 2. This is shown by Spenser's letter to Harvey dated April, 1580, Ibid, p. 612.
 3. His strange delay in adding his voice to the chorus of grief at Sidney's death is an argument given by some to show the absence of intimacy between Sidney and Spenser. Harrison, T. P. Jr. "Relations of Spenser and Sidney" PMLA XLV, 1930, 712 ff.

attempt to relieve the awkward situation.¹

In the Ruines of Time Spenser refers to the motive of the poem where he mentions one published reproach (ll 435-9) and blames himself for his ungratefulness (ll 225-238). A brief Envoy dedicates the poem again to Sidney's sister and his patron's memory.

To Lady Strange, third daughter of Sir John Spencer of Althorpe, he dedicated his Teares of the Muses, because, he says, of "your particular bounties and also some private bands of affinitie which it hath pleased your ladyship to acknowledge." Here, too, Spenser shows the usual desire of the poet to gain fame for his poem through the name of his patron and at the same time to make the dedicatee universally known through his work -- a strange compound of egotism and humility.

Prosopopoeia or Mother Hubberds Tale in this same volume is dedicated to Anne, Lady Compton, and Montegle, another daughter of Sir John Spencer. She

1. Baskerville, C. R. PMLA, XXVIII, 1913, p. 309, n. 2..

is the Phyllis of Colin Clouts Come Home Again, "Phyllis, the floure of rare perfection." The dedication is dated 1591, but the prefatory letter states that it was composed in his youth and lately found. The Queen probably had this poem "called in."¹

Daphnaida, an elegy for the death of Douglas Howard, is dedicated to one of the aunts, Lady Helena, Marquesse of Northampton, an instance, so Miss Sheavyn thinks, of the slight bond often between patron and writer; Spenser wrote this elegy "at the request of a chance patron on a lady whome² he had never seen." But Raleigh was a relative of the husband of the dead girl, and hence it was probably done for his greater friend.

In one of the dedicatory sonnets prefixed to the Faerie Queene, 1590, Spenser addressed Lady Elizabeth Carey, the wife of the Lord Chamberlain, whose company of players included William Shakespeare.

-
1. Jones, H. S. V. A Spenser Handbook, p. 101
 2. Sheavyn, Phoebe, Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age, p. 22.

She was thus in the way of many literary associations. In the sonnet to her Spenser says that he will "display" "in ampler wise" his "good will" to this patron.¹ The next work to be printed was the Muioptomos, dedicated with unusual warmth to this lady. The poem is included in the Complaints volume, entered for publication December 29, 1590. It has been assumed that "these few leaues" in the dedicatory letter apply to the Muioptomos alone, but Emerson² believes the poet had a larger purpose in arranging with that poem the three Visions completing the Complaints. He feels that these four make the fulfilment of his promise in the Faerie Queene sonnet. In the Visions of the World's Vanitie, placed right after the Muioptomos the last few lines of the first sonnet refer to Lady Carey:

"Such as they were (faire Ladie) take in worth,
That when time serues, may bring things better
forth."³

-
1. Cambridge History, Vol. IV, p. 242. Commenting on this sonnet, the writer speaks of it as the "hopeless and adoring pose of Petrarchian flirtation."
 2. Emerson, O. F. "Spenser, Lady Carey and the Complaints Volume" PMLA, XXXII, 1917, 306 ff.
 3. Spenser's Poetical Works, p. 521.

and the last sonnet of the series closes:

"And ye faire Ladie, in whose bounteous breast
All heauenvly grace and vertue shrined is,
When ye these rythmes doo read, and vew the
rest,
Loath this base world, and thinke of heauvens
blis."¹

There is a distinct unity in this group with Lady Carey's name on the title page, and the ardent letter and concluding sonnet addressed to her. This original volume was divided into four sections: (1) Ruines of Time, (2) Teares of the Muses, and Virgil's Gnat, (3) Prosopopoeia and Ruines of Rome, and (4) Mulopotmos and the three Visions. Each of these groups had its separate title page and dedication, making each seem almost a separate booklet.

The fact that Mulopotmos comes last rather than first in the volume, if it was considered so important, may be explained by the fact that in 1590 the publication of an unauthorized edition of Sidney's Arcadia had revived the memory of that beloved figure, and thus Spenser's Ruines of Time was probably put

1. Ibid, p. 526.

first in deference to general feeling. But the placing of these four poems at the end of the volume does not weaken the belief, Emerson feels, that they are a fulfilment of his pledge. A similar promise of "other more worthy labour" was made in a dedicatory letter before Mother Hubberds Tale to Lady Compton and Montegle, and something like it to Lady Strange, but it was never carried out.

After Spenser's return from London in 1591 he wrote the account of his travels and experiences in Colin Clouts Come Home Again . He sent the manuscript with a letter "dated from my house of Killoolman the 27 of December 1591" to Raleigh, to whom he expressed his debt for "singular favours and sundrie good turnes shewed" to him at his "late being in England." The poem did not appear in print until 1595, published with Astrophel and other elegies commemorating Sidney's death. In this "simple pastorall" Spenser alludes to Sidney as Astrofell, Raleigh as Shepherd of the Ocean, the Countess of Pembroke as Urania, the Countess of Cumberland as

Marian, the Marchioness of Northampton as Mansilia, and the daughters of Sir John Spencer of Althorpe. Showing the influence of Sidney's earlier criticism of the pseudo-dialect in Shepheardes Calender, Spenser is careful not to employ it here.

Astrophel, the belated elegy evidently written after 1590, is dedicated "To the most beautiful and vertuous Ladie, the Countesse of Essex," Sidney's widow.

The Amoretti, 1595, is dedicated to the Right Worshipfull Sir Robert Needham, Knight. From the dedicatory letter of the publisher, Ponsonby, it seems that this young soldier returning from Ireland unknowingly brought Spenser's sonnets with him. Because of such protection the publisher feels the Knight merits the dedication. Apparently Spenser did not supervise the printing of this volume, and we see the printer's taking charge of the dedication.

With Amoretti and the accompanying poem, Epithalamion, we have an interesting problem. If the sonnet sequence is to Elizabeth Boyle, the wife

of Spenser, then the story of the courtship properly precedes the marriage hymn. Dr. Long believes the Elizabeth of the sonnets is the Elizabeth Carey above referred to, rather than to the Elizabeth Boyle of the poet's own courtship. In Sonnet LXXIV, one of the few autobiographical sonnets according to Sidney Lee,¹ Spenser apostrophises the "happy letters" which comprise the name Elizabeth, borne he says by his mother, his sovereign, and his wife. Several critics find a deeper note of personal feeling in Amoretti than would be sounded for a poet's official mistress. R. E. Dodge and E. De Selincourt hold this view, while Sidney Lee feels that Spenser's sonnet is a poetic instrument on which he can use his mother-tongue.

In 1596, Spenser was again at the Court, hoping for preferment, and staying in November with the Earl of Essex at Essex House, where he had lived when it belonged to the Earl of Leicester. There

1. Lee, Sidney, Great Englishmen, p. 184, n. 1.

he dedicated to two ladies of rank, Margaret, Countess of Cumberland and Mary, Countess of Warwick, his Four Hymnes. Two of these poems had been in circulation in manuscript form. The Countess of Cumberland had been praised in Colin Clout as Marian:

"Faire Marian, the Muses onely darling
Whose beaultie shyneth as the morning clear,
With silver dew upon the roses pearling."

The other dedicatee was really Mary (not Anne) the wife of Ambrose Dudley, brother of Leicester; she had already been described in the Ruines of Time as a "paragon of fame." From the dedication we find that he beseeches the two "most excellent Ladies" "to accept this my humble service in lieu of the great graces and honourable fauours which ye¹ daily shew unto me." There is an interesting problem in connection with these Hymnes; in the dedication Spenser says he composed two of them in praise of love and beauty "in the greener time of my youth." Finding objections made to their meaning, he had been

1. Spenser's Poetical Works, Oxford, 1929, p. 586.

moved by one of the "two most excellent Ladies to call in the same." Not succeeding in this because too many copies had been scattered, the poet "resolved at least to amend" and wrote two other hymns on heavenly love and beauty. Was Spenser just inventing an excuse for publishing these four hymns? If not, what could one of the ladies have found objectional in the poems on earthly love and beauty? This question leads us, however, beyond our present study.¹

Finally, the Prothalamion, 1596, is in honor of the double marriage of Lady Elizabeth, and Lady Katherine Somerset, daughters of the Earl of Somerset.

It is easy to see that Spenser was a great dedicator. He used the tools of all who struggled for advancement - flattery, servile humility, and promises of eternal fame through his verse. The favors of the great seemed lacking in the last days of the poet's life, though Essex is credited with

1. Cf. Dr. E. B. Fowler's study, The Problem of Spenser's "Poore Hymnes", MS.

with offers of help. It was he who defrayed the expenses of Spenser's funeral -- one whose name held a place in the significant group of dedicatory sonnets to the Faerie Queene.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

Certainly the very earliest authors had no thought of personal gain in dedicating their efforts to some friend. "The dedicated book is nothing more than a rather long friendly letter."¹ Though not always direct proof of patronage, dedications are usually indicative of it, particularly when the terms of address to a nobleman are flattering and glowing. Mr. Wheatley gives three phases in the development² of this universal custom of book dedication. First, he says, there is the stage in which natural love and respect for a friend inspire a dedication to one who will be interested and sympathetic toward the author's work; second, the stage in which a dedication is sold to the one who will pay the most for it, the writer having lost all sense of shame; third, a return to the first stage where the patron has disappeared and

-
1. Holzknacht, Karl, Literary Patronage in the Middle Ages, p. 125.
 2. Wheatley, H. B. Dedication of Books to Patron and Friend, New York, 1887, p. 1 ff, Introduction.

the dedication is merely a means of expressing to a friend the respect and esteem in which he is held. This last is the present system.

The invention of printing gave the author a much wider public than he had ever known and offered him a chance of financial return. Thus the Elizabethan Age, as Holz¹knecht says, differed greatly from the preceding centuries, for the writer tried to become a professional and still keep the old form of patronage.

Elizabethan poetry brought its makers honourable recognition, but not pecuniary reward. Thus we have seen the struggle of writers to secure a patron. Once attached to some wealthy man, the writer found he was still in a difficult position, as he must hold on to his prize. The natural relationship between patron and author now became strained, for the writer tried to force by flattery the attention of a protector so many other authors were craving. The feeling of both parties made anything but an ideal basis for a satisfactory relationship.

1. Holz¹knecht, K. Literary Patronage in the Middle Ages, p. 59 ff.

Patronage is not necessarily degrading, but when flattery was the only form of payment a poor writer could give, truth was often sacrificed. Independence on the part of the author was lost, and in its place came a fawning servility that was one of the greatest evils of the system. Such bought dedications came to be so scorned that gradually the custom died out.

Pandering to the taste of the patron was another harmful feature of patronage. When so great a man as Bacon would stoop to soliciting a choice of theme¹ from his patron, what could be expected from a horde of hungrier and poorer writers? Another evil of this system of protection was the impudence on the part of the dedicatory; as we have seen, they frequently made dedications to men they scarcely knew. Such effrontery was looked down upon by more upright authors.

To these bad features was added another - trickery. The unscrupulous and needy writer did not hesi-

1. Sheavyn, Phoebe, The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age, p. 33.

tate to trap unsuspecting noblemen by securing several names for the same book, each patron in these cases thinking he was the only dedicatee.

From the point of view of the patron, we find the system equally bad. Those who did lend their aid to men of letters were surrounded by impecunious writers. Annoyance these besieged noblemen must have felt. However, there were some who probably encouraged attention from the authors as a mark of distinction. In any case it was a difficult matter to distinguish the worthy writer from the unworthy.

We find that the greatest dramatic and the greatest non-dramatic poets of the age sought the help of influential noblemen and succumbed to the spirit of the times in addressing them in extravagant terms of devotion and love. Shakespeare, soon gaining the approval of the theatre-loving public, did not long have need of private benefactors, but Spenser, fervently desiring political advancement, used his literary work as a means to that end, dedicating to one after another of the court favorites.

Behind the bombast of the dedications of this period lies some sincerity in many cases, but with the increase of needy writers and the decrease of interested patrons of learning it naturally followed that much of the praise was hollow and meaningless.

Hence, we find that patronage as a system could not fit in with the changing conditions of Elizabeth's reign and the years immediately following. It had been outgrown, but, like many a once useful article, it was not soon to be discarded. As a haven for needy writers, however, "patronage ... was moribund."¹ The system continued even into the eighteenth century. Dryden heaped flattery upon the politicians, court favorites, and the king himself; he dedicated his literary work to them and received their favors in return. "The existing methods of literary, and more especially theatrical, competition and the

1. Sheavyn, Phoebe, The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age, p. 13.

consequent necessity of securing the patronage of leaders of society and fashion"¹ made it necessary for him to follow the current methods.

The final blow to literary patronage was dealt by Dr. Johnson, who was "very little accustomed to ask favours from the great."² Only once did he dedicate a work of his own - The Voyage to Abyssinia - and that was addressed to a bookseller. He says himself: "There is no reason why any person should exert himself for a man who has written a good book: he has not written it for any individual When patronage was limited an author expected to find a Maecenas, and complained if he did not find one. This Maecenas has others as good as he, or others who have got the start of him."³ The Dictionary occasioned the letter to the Earl of Chesterfield, which produced his famous definition

-
1. Cambridge History, Vol. VIII, p. 39.
 2. Boswell's Life of Johnson, published by Routledge, Warne, and Routledge, London, 1865, Vol. I, p. 145.
 3. Boswell's Life of Johnson, Vol. II, Oxford, 1927, p. 462.

of a patron and showed his contempt for meaningless
¹
 flattery.

Thus the system which arose with the development of the printing trade ended when the growth of the reading public enabled authors to obtain larger payments from their booksellers. At least one remnant of the patronized poet that has come down to us in modern times is the poet-laureate. This tradition was firmly established by the end of the Middle
²
 Ages, and it grew out of the medieval patronage system.

-
1. Letter to Earl of Chesterfield, Feb. 7, 1775 in Boswell's Life of Johnson, published by Routledge, Warne, and Routledge, London, 1865, p. 145 ff. "Is not a patron, my lord, one who looks with unconcern on a man struggling for life in the water, and, when he has reached ground encumbers him with help?" He concludes this letter by saying that having carried his work thus far without much obligation, he hoped to conclude it with less if possible; he is unwilling "that the public should consider me as owing that to a patron which Providence has enabled me to do for myself." Johnson had addressed to his Lordship the plan of his Dictionary, but Chesterfield had behaved so as to excite the Doctor's indignation. When the Dictionary was on the eve of publication, the Earl hoped it would be dedicated to him and praised Johnson very highly, thus bringing forth this scathing letter.
 2. Holsknecht, K. Literary Patronage in the Middle Ages, p. 234.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acheson, Arthur, Shakespeare's Sonnet Story,
London, 1922.
- Baskerville, C.R., "Early Fame of the Shepheardes
Calender" PMLA, XXVIII, 1913.
- Boswell's Life of Johnson, Vol. I, published by
Routledge, Warne, and Rout-
ledge, London, 1865.
- Boswell's Life of Johnson, Vol. II, Oxford, 1927.
- "C", Notes and Queries, Series III, Vol. IV, 1863.
- Cambridge History of English Literature, Vols. III,
IV, VIII, X.
- Carpenter, F.I., Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser,
Chicago, 1923.
- Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. XVI.
- Einstein, Lewis, Italian Renaissance in England,
London, 1905.
- Emerson, O.F., "Spenser, Lady Carey, and the Com-
plaints Volume" PMLA, XXXII, 1917.
- Emerton, Ephraim, Desiderius Erasmus, New York and
London, 1899.
- Fletcher, J.B., "Spenser" Encyclopedia Americana,
New York, XIV.
- Fowler, E.B. The Problem of Spenser's "Fowre Hymnes"
MS.
- Gosse, E. "Elizabethan Dedications of Books" Harpers,
CV.

- Froude, J.A. Life and Letters of Erasmus, New York, 1894.
- Greenlaw, Edwin, "Spenser and the Earl of Leicester" PMLA, XXV, 1910.
- Harrison, T.P., Jr. "The Relations of Spenser and Sidney" PMLA, XLV, 1930.
- Hales, J.W. and Lee, Sidney, "Spenser" Dictionary of National Biography, XVIII.
- Holzknrecht, Karl, Literary Patronage in the Middle Ages, Philadelphia, 1923.
- Higginson, James J. Spenser's "Shepheardes Calender" in Relation to Contemporary Affairs, New York, 1912.
- Jones, H.S.V. A Spenser Handbook, New York, 1930.
- Lee, Sir Sidney, Elizabethan Sonnets, English Garner, Vol. I, Westminster, 1904.
Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century, New York, 1904.
Life of Shakespeare, New York, 1909.
- Legouis, Emile, A History of English Literature, Vol. I, New York, 1926.
Edmund Spenser, Paris, 1923.
- Lodge, Edmund, Portraits of Illustrious Personages of Great Britain, Vol. IV, New York, 1887.
- Long, P.W. "Spenser and the Bishop of Rochester" PMLA, XXXI, 1916.
- Renwick, W.L. Edmund Spenser, London, 1925.

Schelling, Felix E. English Literature During the
Lifetime of Shakespeare,
New York, 1927.

Shakespeare's Complete Works, ed. Craig, W.J.,
Oxford, 1926.

Sheavyn, Phoebe, The Literary Profession in the
Elizabethan Age,
Manchester, 1909.

Smith, D. Nicol, "Authors and Patrons" Shakespeare's
England, Vol. II, Oxford, 1916.

Spenser's Poetical Works, ed. Smith, J.C. and De
Selincourt, E., Oxford, 1929.

Wheatley, H.B. Dedication of Books to Patron and
Friend, New York, 1887.

Wyndham, George, Essays in Romantic Literature,
London, 1919.